## **Medicare Coverage Policy ~ Decisions**

## **Liver Transplantation for Patients with Malignancies (#CAG-00091N)**

Table 1 Prognostic Factors for Outcomes of Hepatic Transplants in Patients with HCC

Study	Size	Number	Stage	Macrovascular	Differentiation	Extrahepatic	Bilo
Bechstein (2)		Poorer for multiple but not significant	TNM stage IV poorer but not significant	Invasion significant negative			Poo outo but sigr
Figueras 1997 (4)	Greater than 5 cm significant			Survival significantly reduced		Excluded from study	
Figueras 2000 (5)	> 5cm poorer but not significant		Poorer but not significant	Survival significantly reduced		Excluded from study	
Iwatsuki 2000 (9)	Greater than 5 cm risk factor 6.7			Risk factor 15.0		Recurrence within 2 years in all patients	Rick 3.1
Iwatsuki 1991 (10)	Greater than 2 cm significant	Multiple poorer outcome	TNM Stage IV poorer outcomes	Poorer outcome	Infiltrative shape poorer outcome	Significantly poorer outcome	Sigr poo out
Klintmalm (13)	Greater than 5 cm independent variable		Negatively influences survival	Negatively influences survival	Less differentiation is independent variable for poor prognosis	Independent variable for poor prognosis	Neg influ surv
Klintmalm 1998 (14)	Significantly effect outcome negatively		Significantly effected outcome negatively	Significantly effected outcome negatively		Significantly effected outcome negatively	
Marsh 2000 (16)	Significant negative effect	Not significant	No direct correlation with RFS	Significant negative effect		Significant negative effect	Sigr neg effe

Schlitt (23)	Size greater the 5 cm negative association	More than 5 nodules negative association	Stage IV negative association	Negative association			
Min (19)	No difference	No difference if less than 3 cm					
Mazzaferro (18)	Over 5 cm excluded	More than 3 tumors excluded	Not significant	Excluded from study		Excluded from study	
Yamamoto (24)	Greater than 5 cm negative predictor				Negative effect	Negative effect	Neg effe